

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR PROJECT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works a question of a clarifying nature regarding the provision in S. 440 which identifies and establishes the Alameda transportation corridor in my State of California as a "high-priority corridor" under section 1105 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act.

Mr. CHAFEE. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me begin by first commending Senator CHAFEE, the committee chairman, Senator WARNER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and my ranking member Senator BAUCUS for their support in recognizing the Alameda corridor as a project of critical importance not only to California's but to the Nation's economy.

In recent months, the attention of Congress has been focused on how to reduce our budget deficit and how to restructure infrastructure spending. As important as these goals are, it remains critical in this new era in the Federal budget process to support infrastructure projects which have national significance. I support innovative solutions to meet our transportation infrastructure needs.

The Alameda transportation corridor is one of the most critically important infrastructure projects for the Nation. The project will streamline rail and highway transportation between the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and intermodal connections in downtown Los Angeles. The rail portion of the project will consolidate the operations of three freight carriers into one higher speed corridor and eliminate conflicts with highway crossings. Highways will also be improved to provide better access from the ports to the freeways. The increased transportation efficiency will provide the added benefit of decreased air pollution.

Last year the ports handled \$74.3 billion in exported or imported goods. That amount represents 27 percent of the national value of exports and imports. This volume of shipments produces more than \$17.3 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes nationwide. With completion of the project, these figures will substantially increase. The ports estimate that the project will increase national economic output by an estimated \$170 billion annually and will increase total Federal revenues by approximately \$32 billion.

The Alameda corridor will mean billions in increased trade for the United States, hundreds of millions in new tax revenue to State and local govern-

ments throughout the country, and the addition of hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide.

Recognizing the national significance of the project, Mr. President, I would like to pose the following question to Senator CHAFEE: As I understand section 1105 of ISTEA, the designation of the Alameda transportation corridor as a "high-priority corridor" under this section will enable the Secretary of Transportation to work cooperatively with the project sponsors on using creative financing to advance the project, including eligibility for a line a credit. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes. The designation of the Alameda transportation corridor as a "high-priority corridor" reflects the committee's determination that the project merits an ongoing Federal role based upon the long-term potential benefits to interstate and international commerce. The Alameda corridor is, indeed, a project of national significance.

Under section 1105, high-priority corridors are eligible for creative financing with the Secretary. This eligibility includes participation in the Priority Corridor Revolving Loan Fund, the establishment of a line of credit, and other methods of financing. The section 1105 "high-priority" designation allows the corridor project to help itself by making it eligible for these innovative financing options.

I would encourage the Secretary to work with the project sponsors to identify and pursue those creative financing options that will assist the timely completion of the project.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the chairman. I appreciate the clarification and again commend him for his assistance in moving this project forward.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to speak briefly about several votes on amendments to the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. These votes did not reflect a lack of support for helmet and seatbelt laws or speed limits on our highways. They reflected a choice as to the appropriate level of government to make those decisions. I believe these decisions are better decided, not by the Federal Government, but by each individual State, taking into consideration local conditions and local demographics.

Issues involving highway safety have always been important to me, dating back to my years as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I know the members of the Virginia General Assembly and the citizens of my State care very deeply about these issues as well.

Mr. President, existing Federal requirements forcing States to impose safety belt and helmet laws have had their intended consequences. Most States have enacted helmet and seatbelt laws. In my view, the time has come to remove the Federal Government from issues which properly fall within the province of the States. In the spirit of devolving non-Federal re-

sponsibilities to the States, I think we can start with ending the Federal role in setting traffic laws. At some point, we must trust the States on issues which fall particularly within their areas of expertise and for which they bear the full responsibility of enforcement.

To conclude, Mr. President, my votes yesterday were not to repeal safety laws or speed limits. I personally support helmet laws and seatbelt requirements. My votes were to allow Virginia and other States to use their own expertise to determine the laws that will best serve their citizens and enhance their safety.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today as a cosponsor of S. 440 to encourage the adoption of this legislation designating the National Highway System. This bill contains significant reforms that are important to Kansas and our country's transportation system.

There has been a great deal of support for the designation of the National Highway System. The 159,000 miles identified in this bill represent each State's primary routes connecting major population centers, transportation facilities, and other intermodal efforts. Our highway system is a network whose maintenance and upkeep are crucial to our economy. As new technological developments for intermodal transportation are created, the interconnectivity of our country's transportation system becomes increasingly important. This designation will allow for much needed funds to flow to our States directly.

I appreciate the efforts of Senator WARNER and Senator CHAFEE to address specific areas of concern for Kansas. The designation of the I-35 corridor identifies an existing route from Texas to Kansas to Minnesota that is a valuable link between Mexico and Canada. The demands on these transportation routes connecting Canada, the United States, and Mexico will only increase. As our demand for trade among these countries grows, so will our need to develop and maintain these transportation routes.

Several issues addressed in this bill have long been in need of attention. The repeal of the crumb rubber mandate, removal of metric measurements requirements, and hours of service clarifications are of great interest to many Kansans. Although we did not pursue the repeal of Davis-Bacon in this legislation, the repeal of this outdated law will continue to be a high priority. Throughout this debate, efforts have been made to give the States a greater role in setting their own transportation policy. The issue is not whether there should be a speed-limit or mandatory helmet or seatbelt law. The issue is who decides: is it Congress or each of the respective States?

In addition, I would like to thank Senator CHAFEE for joining with me in addressing the concerns of water-well

drillers and the hours-of-service regulations. The language in S. 440 resolves an unintended problem by requiring the drivers of water well drilling rigs to comply with the same hours of service regulations currently provided to drivers of vehicles in oilfield operations while maintaining safety priorities.

I believe the National Highway System designation, as well as other provisions contained in S. 440, provide a positive step forward in addressing our Nation's transportation needs.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of S. 440.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the legislation before us, S. 440, the National Highway Designation Act. This is landmark legislation because it expands the existing Federal Interstate Highway System into a national system that includes the major roadways in every State. The identification of these important State highways and their eligibility for Federal highway funding is a significant step forward in strengthening the transportation network of our country.

As a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and the subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I have been very involved in the drafting of many sections of this bill, the repeals of the crumb rubber and national speed limit mandates and, most importantly to me personally, funding authority for the National Recreational Trails Program. The trails program was established in the original ISTEA bill but has not been fully implemented due to an inconsistent funding source. In this bill we have finally authorized contract funding authority to provide moneys from the Highway Trust Fund to design, build and maintain a national trail system for both motorized and non-motorized recreational uses.

I think that the committee amendment is good legislation. It reflects many hours of diligent and thoughtful effort by the committee members, and I want to particularly acknowledge the efforts of the Transportation Committee Chairman Senator WARNER and his staff.

The committee draft includes several provisions that are of critical importance to both the Nation and my home State of Idaho. These improvements share the common themes of deregulation and decentralization as we streamline and, in some cases, eliminate existing Federal transportation regulations and mandates. Some of these changes to present law revolve around the restoration of States rights in determining how to fund, construct and manage the highways in their individual States. My own State of Idaho has struggled in the past with these very issues because we also believe that these decisions are better left to be resolved by State legislatures. Federal bureaucrats in Washington, DC seldom, if ever, have a better sense of

what is appropriate in the 50 individual States than those folks who are elected locally.

We have seen over and over again that rules and regulations drafted in Washington, DC which are designed to deal with specific regional problems, but which have national application, often times are too far reaching and burdensome to a majority of the country. Prime examples of these types of mandates presently in highway legislation include the national speed limit mandate, the financial penalties for noncompliance with mandatory helmet and seat belt laws and the financial penalties for noncompliance with the crumb rubber requirement.

It is not reasonable to assume that highway conditions and demands are the same in a predominately urban and heavily populated State as they would be in a primarily rural State like Idaho. For example the needs of Atlanta, Idaho, which has a population of just 200, a single road, one bridge, and plenty of wide open spaces are quite different from the needs of Atlanta, GA which has a population of 500,000.

The application of the crumb rubber minimum utilization requirement may work in some geographic areas that do not have great temperature variations and light commercial truck volume but, in the high mountain passes of Idaho, this mandate was a failure and resulted in a waste of both Federal and State highway dollars. This Idaho crumb rubber pilot project was on U.S. 30 at the Fish Creek Summit which is situated at an elevation of 5,000 feet. Mr. Brent Frank, the Idaho DOT District 5 engineer, reported that the section of highway where crumb rubber was used displayed severe wheel rutting of up to 3 inches in depth after just 1 year. Normal wear of conventional paving materials would be 1 inch of rutting in 10 years. And, although Mr. Frank is reluctant to place the total blame for the accelerated deterioration on the recycled paving material, the Idaho DOT has suspended a second project that was to use the recycled material. There simply was not sufficient research and study conducted on this process prior to implementation of the mandate.

The good news is that each of the examples I have cited has been addressed to one degree or another in the committee bill. Several additional amendments will be offered which afford even more flexibility and discretion to local authorities to design programs that fit the needs of their constituents. I have co-sponsored two of these which deal with the repeal of financial penalties for noncompliance with Federal seat belt and helmet laws. Do I personally always use seat belts? Do I require that our children always wear seat belts? Absolutely. But I believe that this is a decision that should be made by the individual State legislatures.

These types of issues should not be decided by congressional studies or surveys, but rather on the constitutional

grounds of the 10th amendment. I am unconditionally opposed to Federal edicts and mandates to the States, particularly in matters such as these where the Federal Government imposes financial penalties on States by redirecting moneys from a trust fund that was paid for by the very citizens that are being penalized.

I am hopeful that a majority of our colleagues will join in the effort to return these decisions where they belong—to the individual States.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, once again the managers would like to address the Senate in the hopes that we can tonight ascertain the full list of amendments that will be considered on this bill. The list as it now stands of Senators is as follows: Senator FRIST, Senator COHEN, Senator SMITH, Senator INOUE, Senator HATFIELD, Senator MCCAIN, Senator JOHNSTON, Senator FORD, Senator GRAMS, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator STEVENS, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator SARBANES, Senator FORD, Senator EXON, Senator BOXER, Senator CHAFEE, Senator NICKLES, and the amendment by the managers.

I ask my colleagues. Are there further amendments?

Mr. BAUCUS. Might I ask my good friend and colleague from Virginia? Does he have Senator STEVENS?

Mr. WARNER. We have Senators STEVENS and MURKOWSKI.

Mr. BAUCUS. JOHNSTON?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Three amendments by Senator EXON?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. BAUCUS. JOHN KERRY?

Mr. WARNER. I suggest you add him—he was on and struck off—if you wish to put him back on.

Mr. BAUCUS. Two Boxer amendments?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. BAUCUS. SARBANES?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. BAUCUS. And the managers?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. BAUCUS. That is the list.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, that is the list as we know it.

I now ask unanimous consent that that constitute the remaining amendments that can be brought up on this bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, because of our inability to resolve an issue that affects our State, not having the assurance that we can resolve this, even though I arranged for a meeting to take place tomorrow morning relative to the concerns that we have concerning that issue, I feel I must object.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I remind the Senator that we have his amendment on this list. We can add a second amendment. So he can have two amendments on this list.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I might also remind the Senator that there is no time agreement. So I think the Senator is fully protected.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is fully protected. But it would enable the leaders in the Senate and the managers to get this bill through.

So I once again ask unanimous consent.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am sorry. This is of such importance to us. I appreciate the patience of the floor managers and the fact we are going to proceed with this tomorrow. But we have been at this for some 15 years since statehood, and we are so close to it now that unless we can reach some kind of an accord, I feel compelled to raise an objection at this time.

Mr. WARNER. If I could say one thing to my colleague at this time, let us make it clear that we have accepted one amendment from Alaska. We are going to clear it tonight. The second one, of which the Senator spoke, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has no jurisdiction whatsoever.

Am I not correct?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. It is a matter that rests before the committee of which the distinguished Senator is the chairman.

Given those facts, would the Senator not be fully protected by just leaving it on the list and, therefore, we can have a unanimous consent agreement that this list constitutes the totality of all amendments?

I ask the Senator once again so we can move this bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I think my friend from Virginia would recognize that in the years I have been here I have been most cooperative in trying to accommodate various Members. But this is an issue that is as important to us as any issue that we have ever had, and it is simply the right of access across Federal lands so that we can get to our private lands in the State, and there is an environmental objection from various groups that have persuaded Members that this is something they simply do not want to see addressed and resolved.

We see no other alternative other than to attempt to use every method that we can to try to bring some justice to the contract that was made when we entered into the statehood compact. The fact that we have been at this for so long, the fact that it belongs in this bill—and I recognize the comment made by the Senator from Virginia that some of the objection is within the Energy Committee, of which I happen to chair, and I hope that I will be able to prevail.

I wonder if the senior Senator from Alaska has any comments relative to this.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do believe we speak for the State of Utah also that has a similar problem which is very pertinent to this bill. This is the high-

way bill. We are trying to preserve our highway rights of way as other western States have. And we now find a new form of discrimination against us because we seek to use the rights of way created by the public over Federal lands. I think we are entitled to persist on this as long as we have to in order to get our rights recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, might I inquire of the Senators from Alaska if there is some other provision we could incorporate in this agreement to accommodate them? They are protected. They now have an opportunity to offer an amendment. There is no time agreement.

I wonder if there is anything else we might consider at this point that the Senators would like to suggest that we could possibly incorporate in this agreement so that we can accommodate the Senator's interest.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object again, I am waiting for some information from our State and from our offices in the State regarding this matter. I thought we were on our way to settling this earlier today. We are not. We have to get a considerable amount of material in. We will not get it in tonight. We do operate on a situation where, you will recall, it is 4 hours earlier in our State. But we still are in the situation where we have to wait until they open in the morning and send us the information.

I do think it is not an unreasonable request that we be permitted to have the time necessary to deal with this objection. We just heard this afternoon.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana made a suggestion, if we could agree on the other amendments, to have the Senator from Alaska have the right to offer an amendment any time before final disposition of the bill, and that will give them time to decide precisely what amendment, if any, they wish to offer. Of course, the materials are not here. You are not going to let the bill go to final disposition. At least we would have a partial cap on the amendments.

I think the managers are prepared to stay here tonight and not have any more votes but to accept some amendments that may be pending.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but it is just simply inconceivable and unacceptable to those of us in Alaska that this basic right that we were guaranteed under the statehood compact that we go out and identify those traditional trails, winter trails, access wagon roads, across Federal lands that have been utilized and those that have been completed—some 500 and some have been documented—and submitted, that we cannot consummate what was guaranteed under the Statehood Act.

It is very disappointing to me to find objections from other Senators that

are strictly based on the feeling that this is a giant land grab. This is nothing more than the opportunity for the citizens of the State to traverse Federal land so they can get to their private land, so they can get to the State land.

It is something every single State—at least in the western United States—which had any public land has enjoyed. And we simply cannot understand why it is not acceptable.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I shall not object, if the suggestion under the majority leader is incorporated—in other words, if we are not limited in the solution we may want to offer to this bill to this problem. We do not want to be tied down to just one amendment or amendments that might not be in order in terms of the circumstances that might be developed under this unanimous-consent agreement.

My understanding is that the leader has suggested we be permitted to offer an amendment or amendments to deal with the problems we have been talking about, and there will be no time limit on the bill under the circumstances of the agreement.

I do not object.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I renew the request.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I have a similar situation. I have two amendments pending. I am very willing to go with this approach. It would be very important to have the request for the amendments of the Senators from Alaska incorporated, so that, if we find another way to stop a problem, we are not inhibited from doing so.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous consent request as amended by the colloquy between the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Alaska, and the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I would like considered and I would like it placed on the list as well.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I amend the unanimous consent request to include the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I also suggest to my good colleague that that request be subject to the usual parameters of the previous agreement, that is, the parameters of order No. 114, essentially that the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments in order and subject to relevant second degree, et cetera—the same parameters that are contained in order 114 of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Now, Mr. President, the managers are prepared to continue consideration of amendments. We have several amendments which can be cleared, and we will proceed to do that expeditiously.

Mr. DOLE. Is it fair to announce there will be no more votes this evening?

Mr. WARNER. Correct.

Mr. DOLE. There will be no more votes tonight.

AMENDMENT NO. 1455

(Purpose: To include the Dalton Highway in Alaska in the designation of the National Highway System)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for Mr. STEVENS, proposes an amendment numbered 1455.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 36, on line 12, strike the quotation mark and second period and insert:

“(24) The Dalton Highway from Deadhorse, Alaska to Fairbanks, Alaska.”.

Mr. WARNER. I believe this amendment has been cleared by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, it has been cleared. I urge its adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the managers for accepting this amendment. It merely clarifies the status of the road that parallels the Alaska pipeline, an Alaska highway that can be the subject of expenditure of Federal highway funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I believe the vote is in order, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1455) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1456

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California,

Mrs. BOXER, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 1456.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the appropriate place, insert the following: “At the end of section 5309(g)(4) of title 49, U.S.C., add the following new sentence: ‘The Secretary may enter future obligations in excess of 50 percent of said uncommitted cash balance for the purpose of contingent commitments for projects authorized under section 3032 of Public Law 102-240.’”

Mr. CHAFEE. This is an amendment that has been cleared by both sides and is acceptable.

Mr. BAUCUS. The Senator is correct. This is offered on behalf of Senator BOXER dealing with future obligations. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1456) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1457

(Purpose: To maintain eligibility under the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program for areas that received funding during fiscal year 1994 and are non-attainment areas that have been redesignated as maintenance areas)

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HELMS and Mr. THOMPSON, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for Mr. FRIST, for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HELMS and Mr. THOMPSON, proposes an amendment numbered 1457.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 26, line 3, strike “1995” and insert “1994”.

On page 26, line 8, strike “1995” and insert “1994”.

On page 26, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(c) EFFECT OF LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.—Notwithstanding any other law, for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997, any limitation under this section or an amendment made by this section on an apportionment otherwise authorized under section 1003(a)(4) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Ef-

ficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 1919) shall not affect any hold harmless apportionment adjustment under section 1015(a) of the Act (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 1943).

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1457) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1458

(Purpose: To make an amendment relating to the operating costs of the Boston-to-Portland rail corridor)

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might interject, I believe this is an amendment by Mr. COHEN of Maine.

I believe the Senator from Virginia is correct that it is now an amendment on behalf of Mr. COHEN, and I request that the clerk so amend the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. COHEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1458.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1 . AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR BOSTON-TO-PORTLAND RAIL CORRIDOR.

Section 5309 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

“(p) BOSTON-TO-PORTLAND RAIL CORRIDOR.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to \$3,600,000 of the funds made available under this section for the rail corridor between Boston, Massachusetts and Portland, Maine may be used to pay for operating costs arising in connection with such rail corridor under section 5333(b).”.

Mr. WARNER. I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair, and also the staff of the Senate. It appears that that should now be an amendment by the Senator from Maine, Mr. COHEN, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk so amend the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I am advised Senator SNOWE likewise wishes to be a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that she be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1458) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1459

(Purpose: To make an amendment relating to surface transportation projects in the State of Hawaii)

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. INOUE, for himself and Mr. AKAKA, proposes an amendment numbered 1459.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1. REVISION OF AUTHORITY OF MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS.

Section 3035(w) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2136) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Of the funds provided by this subsection, \$100,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for regionally significant ground transportation projects in the State of Hawaii."

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this is an amendment relating to surface transportation projects in the State of Hawaii. We have examined this amendment and agree to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1459) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1460

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. JOHNSTON, for himself and Mr. BREAUX, proposes an amendment numbered 1460.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Add new section as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, section 1105(e)(2) of Public Law 102-240 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "A feasibility study may be conducted under this subsection to identify routes that will expedite future emergency evacuations of coastal areas of Louisiana."

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this is a feasibility study which I think merits our consideration and approval. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1460) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1461

(Purpose: To modify the authorization for a demonstration project in Minnesota)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for Mr. Grams, for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 1461.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1. 34TH STREET CORRIDOR PROJECT IN MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA.

Section 149(a)(5)(A) of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-17; 101 Stat. 181) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "and" at the end; and

(2) by inserting "and (iii) a safety overpass," after "interchange,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1461) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent there be a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have stated several times my intention to move as soon as possible to the regulatory reform bill. Regulatory reform is one of the most important issues this Congress will face, and the American people have made clear that they expect us to act. Regulatory reform does not have to be a partisan issue.

Democrats and Republicans alike have seen a need to inject common sense into how the Federal Government crafts regulations. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that we cannot continue to bear \$500 billion of added costs to the economy. That is why I believe it is important that we pass a strong regulatory reform bill, with bipartisan support.

Senator HEFLIN, for example, has provided welcome leadership in helping to craft this bill. I have been working with Senator JOHNSTON for some time to produce a strong regulatory reform package, in order to ensure that Congress answers America's call for relief.

I am pleased to say that I think Senator JOHNSTON and I have reached an agreement on at least a discussion draft, a package that we believe will enjoy broad support. My intention would be to, as soon as the draft is completed, ask that the draft be printed in the RECORD today so that everybody might have an opportunity to see it. Earlier this year, we had a dispute because not all Members had seen a draft on an earlier piece of legislation. Hopefully, by Tuesday of next week, we can bring that bill to the floor and try to complete it by the end of next week. We can put that into the RECORD today.

Again, this is a draft. We reached an agreement on this. It does not mean it may be the perfect answer or there may not be change between now and next Tuesday. I have talked to some of my colleagues on the other side, such as the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, and many are wanting an opportunity to see what the draft is. By printing it in the RECORD, it will be available tomorrow, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday and, hopefully, we can go to it on Tuesday.

I have suggested, and the Senator from Louisiana suggested, that we make that statement on the floor.

I yield to Senator JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the distinguished leader for his statement. He is correct that he and I have agreed upon a draft. It has been arrived at after extensive conversations, negotiations and